Exhibit B

	93CMMADP1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	X
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	v. 09 CR 213 (DC)
5	BERNARD L. MADOFF,
6	Defendant.
7	x
8	New York, N.Y. March 12, 2009
9	10:00 a.m.
10	Before:
11	
12	HON. DENNY CHIN,
13	District Judge
14	APPEARANCES
15	LEV L. DASSIN
16	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York
17	MARC O. LITT LISA BARONI
18	Assistant United States Attorneys
19	DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP Attorneys for Defendant
20	BY: IRA LEE SORKIN DANIEL J. HORWITZ
21	NICOLE P. DE BELLO MAURO M. WOLFE
22	ALSO PRESENT: STEVEN GARFINKEL, FBI
23	KEITH KELLY, FBI JULIA SCHULTE HANISH, USDOJ, FBI
24	THEODORE V. CACIOPPI, FBI
25	

25

1 (Case called) 2 MR. LITT: Marc Litt for the United States. With me 3 at counsel table are Lisa Baroni, an Assistant U.S. Attorney, 4 and four FBI agents: Steven Garfinkel, Keith Kelly, Julia 5 Hanish, and Ted Cacioppi. Good morning, your Honor. 6 MR. SORKIN: Good morning, your Honor. On behalf of 7 the defendant Bernard L. Madoff, the law firm of Dickstein 8 Shapiro LLP. Mr. Madoff is sitting to my left. To my right is 9 Daniel Horwitz of my firm. To Mr. Madoff's left is Mauro Wolfe 10 from my firm, and to Mr. Wolfe's left is Nicole De Bello from 11 my firm. Good morning. 12 THE COURT: Good morning. 13 Mr. Sorkin, your client is still prepared to plead 14 guilty today as we discussed on Tuesday? 15 MR. SORKIN: Yes, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, if you would stand, please, 17 and the deputy clerk will administer the oath. 18 (Defendant sworn) 19 MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, before you begin the 20 allocution, we have provided the government and the court reporter with a copy of the allocution that Mr. Madoff will 21 22 read, and we have a copy if the Court wishes to see it as well. 23 THE COURT: Yes. Thank you. 24 MR. SORKIN: May I hand it up?

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This statement is intended to cover all 11 counts? MR. SORKIN: Yes, your Honor. After your Honor goes through, he will give a statement which we believe will cover all the elements. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, do you understand that you are now under oath and that if you answer my questions falsely, your untrue answers may later be used against you in another prosecution for perjury or making false statements? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Try to keep your voice up so that I can hear you, please. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. MR. SORKIN: Can we get some water, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes. MR. LITT: I would note that the defendant has not yet been arraigned on the information. THE COURT: All right. That's true. Technically, we did the first part of it. We never did the final part. Let me just ask the final question. Mr. Madoff, the other day you waived indictment and you consented to being charged by an information of the government, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And how do you now plead to the information, guilty or not guilty?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
2	THE COURT: Before I accept the plea I will conduct
3	the allocution.
4	Would you state your full name for the record, please.
5	THE DEFENDANT: Bernard L. Madoff.
6	THE COURT: On Tuesday you told me your age and
7	educational background. We talked a little bit about your
8	medical condition. Has your medical condition changed since
9	Tuesday?
10	THE DEFENDANT: No, it has not.
11	THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have you taken any
12	drugs, medicine, or pills, or have you drunk any alcohol?
13	THE DEFENDANT: No.
14	THE COURT: Is your mind clear today?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.
16	THE COURT: And are you feeling all right today under
17	the circumstances?
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.
19	THE COURT: Do either counsel have any doubt as to Mr.
20	Madoff's competence to plead at this time?
21	MR. LITT: The government does not.
22	MR. SORKIN: No, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Now, Mr. Madoff, as I understand it, you
24	wish to plead guilty today to all 11 counts of the information,
25	is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is correct.

THE COURT: Have you had a full opportunity to discuss your case with Mr. Sorkin and to discuss the consequences of pleading guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: You told me on Tuesday that you were satisfied with Mr. Sorkin and his representation of you. Are you still satisfied?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Madoff's responses to my questions and my observations of his demeanor, I find that he is fully competent to enter an informed plea at this time.

Now, Mr. Madoff, before I accept any plea from you I am going to ask you some additional questions that are intended to satisfy me that you wish to plead guilty because you are guilty and that you fully understand the consequences of your plea. If you do not understand any of my questions, please ask me or Mr. Sorkin to explain.

I am going to describe to you certain rights that you have under the Constitution and laws of the United States. You will be giving up these rights if you plead guilty, so please listen carefully.

Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you which are contained in the information. If

there were a trial, you would be presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove your guilt by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove that you were innocent if you were to go to trial.

If there were a trial, you would have the right to be represented by an attorney. And if you could not afford one, an attorney would be provided for you free of cost.

If there were a trial, you would have a right to see and hear all the witnesses against you and your attorney could cross-examine them. You would have a right to have your attorney object to the government's evidence and to offer evidence on your own behalf if you so desired, and you would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense.

If there were a trial, you would have the right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you to testify if you did not want to. Furthermore, no inference or suggestion of guilt could be drawn if you chose not to testify at trial.

Mr. Madoff, do you understand each and every one of these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by pleading guilty today you are giving up each and every one of these rights, you are waiving these rights, and you will have no trial?

1	THE DEFENDANT: I do.
2	THE COURT: Do you understand that you have the right
3	even now to refuse to plead guilty?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
5	THE COURT: You do not have to enter a plea of guilty
6	if you do not want to, for any reason.
7	Do you understand that?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Now, did you receive a copy of the
10	information?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
12	THE COURT: And as we discussed on Tuesday and as we
13	discussed a moment ago, do you understand that you have waived
14	your right to be charged by an indictment, which is issued by a
15	grand jury, and you have consented to being charged by the
16	information which is issued by the prosecutor?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And did you waive that right voluntarily
19	and knowingly?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Now, I am going to review the counts with
22	you. As we said, the information contains 11 counts.
23	Count One charges securities fraud.
24	Count Two charges investment adviser fraud.
25	Count Three charges mail fraud.

1	Count Four charges wire fraud.
2	Count Five charges international money laundering to
3	promote fraud in the sale of securities.
4	Count Six charges international money laundering to
5	conceal the proceeds of fraud in the sale of securities.
6	Count Seven charges money laundering.
7	Count Eight charges making false statements.
8	Count Nine charges perjury.
9	Count Ten charges making a false filing with the
10	Securities and Exchange Commission.
11	And Count Eleven charges theft from an employee
12	benefit plan.
13	Do you understand that those are the charges against
14	you?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
16	THE COURT: I'll ask the government to advise the
17	defendant of the elements of the crimes.
18	MR. LITT: Yes, your Honor. With respect to Count
19	One, securities fraud
20	THE COURT: Hold on one second.
21	Mr. Madoff, you can be seated. Pour yourself some
22	water.
23	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
24	MR. LITT: With respect to Count One, securities
25	fraud, in order to prove the crime of securities fraud, the

government must establish each of the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, the defendant did any one or more of the following:

(1) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud or (2) made an untrue statement of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact which made what was said under the circumstances misleading; or (3) engaged in an act, practice, or course of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon a purchaser or seller.

Second, that the defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and with the intent to defraud;

And, third, that the defendant knowingly used or caused to be used any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or the use of the mails in furtherance of the fraudulent conduct.

With respect to investment adviser fraud, the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt all four of the following elements: First, that the defendant was an investment adviser; second, that the defendant either (A) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud clients and prospective clients; (B) engaged in a transaction, practice, or course of business which operated as a fraud or deceit upon those clients and prospective clients; or (C) engaged in an act, practice, and course of business that was fraudulent,

2.2

deceptive, and manipulative.

Third, that the defendant devised or participated in such alleged device, scheme, or artifice to defraud or engaged in such alleged transaction, practice, or course of business, knowingly, willfully, and with intent to defraud.

And, fourth, that the defendant employed such alleged device, scheme, or artifice to defraud or engaged in such alleged transaction, practice, or course of business by use of the mails or other instrumentality of interstate commerce.

In order to prove the crime of mail fraud, the government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt the following four elements:

First, that at or about the time alleged in the indictment there was a scheme or artifice to defraud in order to obtain property or money by false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises;

Second, that the false or fraudulent statements and representations concerned material facts;

Third, that the defendant knowingly and willfully devised or participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud;

And, fourth, that the United States Mails were used in furtherance of the scheme as specified in the information.

In order to prove the crime of wire fraud the

government must establish the following four essential elements:

First, that at or about the time alleged in the information there was a scheme or artifice to defraud in order to obtain property or money by false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises;

Second, that the false or fraudulent statements and representations concerned material facts;

Third, that the defendant knowingly and willfully devised or participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud

And, fourth, that interstate or foreign wire facilities were used in furtherance of the scheme to defraud as specified in the information.

In order to prove the crime of unlawful transportation of funds or monetary instruments with the intent to promote the carrying on of specified unlawful activity, in violation of Section 1956(a)(2)(A), the government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following elements:

First, that the defendant transported a monetary instrument or funds from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States, or to a place in the United States from or through a place outside the United States;

(212) 805-0300

And, second, that the defendant did so with the intent to promote the carrying on of specified unlawful activity.

In order to prove the crime of unlawful transportation of funds or monetary instruments to conceal and disguise the proceeds of specified unlawful activity, the government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following:

First, that the defendant transported a monetary instrument or funds from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States, or to a place in the United States from or through a place outside the United States;

And, second, that the defendant did so with the knowledge that the monetary instrument or funds involved represent the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity;

And, third, that the defendant did so with knowledge that the transportation was designed in whole or in part to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, or control of the proceeds of securities fraud, mail fraud, wire fraud, and theft from an employee benefit plan.

In order to prove the crime of engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity in violation of Section 1957, the government must establish the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant engaged or attempted to engage in a monetary transaction in or affecting interstate

commerce;

Second, that the monetary transaction involved criminally derived property of a value greater than \$10,000;

Third, that the property was derived from specified unlawful activity; in this case, from securities fraud, mail fraud, wire fraud, or theft from a pension benefit plan;

Fourth, that the defendant acted knowingly; that is, with knowledge that the transaction involved proceeds of a criminal offense;

And, fifth, that the transaction took place in the United States or that the defendant is a United States person.

In order to prove the crime of making false statements to the SEC, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1001, the government must establish the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant made a statement or representation;

Second, that the statement or representation was material;

Third, that the statement or representation was false, fictitious or fraudulent;

Fourth, that the false, fictitious or fraudulent statement was made knowingly or willfully;

And, fifth, that the statement or representation was made in a matter within the jurisdiction of the government of the United States.



To prove the crime of perjury the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following:

First, that the defendant took an oath to testify truly before the Securities and Exchange Commission, a body authorized by law to administer oaths;

Second, that the defendant made false statements as to matters about which the defendant testified under oath as set forth in the information:

Third, that the matters as to which it is charged that the defendant made false statements were material to the issues under inquiry by the Securities and Exchange Commission;

And, fourth, that such false statements were willfully made.

To prove the offense of making a false filing with the SEC the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following:

First, that the defendant was required to file an application, report, or document with the SEC under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the rules and regulations thereunder;

Second, that the application, report, or document filed with the SEC contained false or misleading statements;

Third, that the false or misleading statements were material;

And, fourth, that the defendant acted knowingly and

willfully.

To prove the offense of theft from an employee pension benefit plan the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following elements:

First, that the defendant abstracted or converted to his own use or the use of others the monies, funds, securities, premiums, credits, property, or other assets of an employee welfare benefit plan;

Second, that the funds abstracted or converted from -excuse me, that the fund abstracted or converted from was an
employee welfare benefit plan within the meaning of the
statute;

And, third, that the defendant acted knowingly and willfully.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Madoff, would you rise again, please.

Mr. Madoff, do you understand that if you were to go to trial the government would have to prove all of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now I am going to review with you the maximum possible penalties for the crimes in question.

Count One charging securities fraud carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$5 million, or twice the gross gain or twice the

gross loss, a mandatory special assessment of \$100, and a maximum term of supervised release of three years.

In fact, each count carries a mandatory special assessment of \$100, so I am not going to repeat that for each of the 11 counts.

Count Two charges investment adviser fraud. It carries a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$10,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, and a maximum term of supervised release of three years.

Count Three, the mail fraud count, charges a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, and a maximum term of supervised release of three years.

In fact, all 11 counts carry the same maximum term of supervised release of three years, so I won't repeat that either.

I'm up to Count Four, the wire fraud count. That carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss.

Count Five, the international money laundering count, the first of those counts, carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of

\$500,000, twice the value of the funds involved, or twice the gross gain to any person or twice the pecuniary loss to any person other than yourself.

Count Six, the second international money laundering count, carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$500,000, or twice the value of the funds involved or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Seven, a money laundering count, charges a maximum sentence of ten years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Eight, which charges making false statements, carries a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Nine charges perjury. It carries a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Ten charges making a false filing with the SEC. It carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$5 million, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Finally, Count Eleven, which charges theft from an

employee benefit plan, carries a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Do you understand that those are the possible maximum sentences?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now, taking all the counts together, do you understand that the total maximum sentence of incarceration that you face is 150 years' imprisonment?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: In addition, do you understand that as part of your sentence I can order restitution to any person or entity injured as a result of your criminal conduct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

MR. LITT: Your Honor, I would just note that restitution is mandatory, not discretionary.

THE COURT: I will order restitution if it's mandatory.

You understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: I mentioned supervised release. By that I mean that you would be subject to monitoring when you were released from prison under terms and conditions that could lead to reimprisonment without a jury trial if you were to violate them. And if you were to violate the terms of your supervised

release you could be sent back to prison for the entire term of your supervised release.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you a citizen of the United States?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Do you understand that as a result of your guilty plea you may lose certain valuable civil rights, such as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess any kind of firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now, have you talked to Mr. Sorkin about the federal sentencing guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the guidelines are now advisory only and that they are no longer mandatory?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Nonetheless, before I can sentence you I still have to determine what your sentencing range is under the guidelines. I can't do that until after the probation department prepares a presentence report and you, your lawyer, and the government have had a chance to review the report and to make any objections.

Do you understand that?

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: And even after I decide what your 3 guideline range is, I still have the authority in appropriate 4 circumstances to impose a sentence that is above or below the quideline range. 5 6 Do you understand that? 7 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 8 THE COURT: Do you understand that parole has been 9 abolished in the federal system and, thus, you would not be 10 released from prison any earlier on parole? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Do you understand that if your attorneys 13 or anyone else has attempted to predict what your sentence will 14 be that the prediction could be wrong? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 16 THE COURT: And that is because no one, not your 17 attorney, not the government, can or should make any promises 18 to you as to what your sentence will be as your sentence cannot 19 be decided until after the presentence report is completed, I 20 have ruled on any objections, and I have decided whether there 21 is any basis to go above or below the guideline range. 2.2 Do you understand that? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Finally, do you understand that even if

your sentence turns out to be different from what your attorney

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

or anyone else has told you it might be, or even if your sentence turns out to be different from what you expect, you will still be bound to your guilty plea and you will not be allowed to withdraw your plea of guilty?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by pleading guilty you may be giving up or waiving certain aspects of your right to appeal?

THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: The government provided your lawyers with a letter, dated March 10, 2009, which we call a Pimentel letter?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you review that with your lawyers?

THE DEFENDANT: I did.

THE COURT: And that Pimentel letter explains that your guideline sentence is 150 years.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: That's the government's calculation. That's the government's position and you and your lawyers will have the opportunity to comment on that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you understand also that this

23 Do you understand that?

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

calculation that's set forth in the government's letter is not binding on the Court?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Has anyone offered you any inducements or threatened you or forced you to plead guilty?

> THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Sorkin, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at trial, or do you know any reason why your client should not be permitted to plead guilty?

> THE DEFENDANT: I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, tell me what you did.

MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, may I make one, respectfully -- according to the Pimentel letter, we agree that while the maximum statutory penalty in terms of imprisonment is 150 years, the guideline range -- and this can be found on page 6 of the Pimentel letter -- is life imprisonment. The criminal history category I yields a sentencing range of life imprisonment.

THE COURT: I understand. But the government goes on further to take the position that when a count does not permit life, then you look at the statutory maximum. That's the government's position.

MR. SORKIN: I just want to make sure Mr. Madoff understood that. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Technically, the guideline range is life, but none of the counts in question carries a sentence that can go up to life. The top is 20 years. According to the government, in that circumstance then the guideline range is the maximum and the government's position is that the guideline range is 150 years. Again, I don't know whether Mr. Sorkin agrees or disagrees, but we will deal with that before sentencing.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, would you tell me what you did, please.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, for many years up until my arrest on December 11, 2008, I operated a Ponzi scheme through the investment advisory side of my business, Bernard L. Madoff Securities LLC, which was located here in Manhattan, New York, at 885 Third Avenue. I am actually grateful for this opportunity to publicly speak about my crimes, for which I am so deeply sorry and ashamed. As I engaged in my fraud, I knew what I was doing wrong, indeed criminal. When I began the Ponzi scheme I believed it would end shortly and I would be able to extricate myself and my clients from the scheme. However, this proved difficult, and ultimately impossible, and as the years went by I realized that my arrest and this day

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would inevitably come. I am painfully aware that I have deeply hurt many, many people, including the members of my family, my closest friends, business associates, and the thousands of clients who gave me their money. I cannot adequately express how sorry I am for what I have done. I am here today to accept responsibility for my crimes by pleading guilty and, with this plea allocution, explain the means by which I carried out and concealed my fraud.

The essence of my scheme was that I represented to clients and prospective clients who wished to open investment advisory and individual trading accounts with me that I would invest their money in shares of common stock, options, and other securities of large well-known corporations, and upon request, would return to them their profits and principal. Those representations were false for many years. Up until I was arrested on December 11, 2008, I never invested these funds in the securities, as I had promised. Instead, those funds were deposited in a bank account at Chase Manhattan Bank. clients wished to receive the profits they believed they had earned with me or to redeem their principal, I used the money in the Chase Manhattan bank account that belonged to them or other clients to pay the requested funds. The victims of my scheme included individuals, charitable organizations, trusts, pension funds, and hedge funds. Among other means, I obtained their funds through interstate wire transfers they sent from

financial institutions located outside New York State to the bank account of my investment advisory business, located in Manhattan, New York, and through mailings delivered by the United States Postal Service and private interstate carriers to my firm here in Manhattan.

I want to emphasize today that while my investment advisory business, the vehicle of my wrongdoing, was part of my firm, Bernard L. Madoff Securities, the other businesses my firm engaged in, proprietary trading and market making, were legitimate, profitable, and successful in all respects. Those businesses were managed by my brother and two sons.

To the best of my recollection, my fraud began in the early 1990s. At that time, the country was in a recession and this posed a problem for investments in the securities markets. Nevertheless, I had received investment commitments from certain institutional clients and understood that those clients, like all professional investors, expected to see their investments out-perform the market. While I never promised a specific rate of return to my client, I felt compelled to satisfy my clients' expectations, at any cost. I therefore claimed that I employed an investment strategy I had developed, called the split strike conversion strategy, to falsely give the appearance to clients that I had achieved the results I believed they expected.

Through the split strike conversion strategy I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

promised to clients and prospective clients that client funds would be invested in a basket of common stocks within the Standard & Poors 100 index, a collection of the 100 largest publicly-traded companies in terms of their market capitalization. I promised that I would select a basket of stocks that would closely mimic the price movements of the Standard & Poors 100 index. I promised that I would opportunistically time those purchases and would be out of the market intermittently, investing client funds during these periods in United States Government-issued securities, such as United States Treasury bills. In addition, I promised that as part of the split strike conversion strategy, I would hedge the investments I made in the basket of common stocks by using client funds to buy and sell option contracts related to those stocks, thereby limiting potential client losses caused by unpredictable changes in stock prices. In fact, I never made those investments I promised clients, who believed they were invested with me in the split strike conversion strategy.

To conceal my fraud, I misrepresented to clients, employees, and others that I purchased securities for clients in overseas markets. Indeed, when the United States Securities and Exchange Commission asked me to testify as part of an investigation they were conducting about my investment advisory business, I knowingly gave false testimony under oath to the staff of the SEC on May 19, 2006 that I executed trades of

common stock on behalf of my investment advisory clients and that I purchased and sold the equities that were part of my investment strategy in European markets. In that session with the SEC, which took place here in Manhattan, New York, I also knowingly gave false testimony under oath that I had executed options contracts on behalf of my investment advisory clients and that my firm had custody of the assets managed on behalf of my investment advisory clients.

To further cover up the fact that I had not executed trades on behalf of my investment advisory clients, I knowingly caused false trading confirmations and client account statements that reflected the bogus transactions and positions to be created and sent to clients purportedly involved in the split strike conversion strategy, as well as other individual clients I defrauded who believed they had invested in securities through me. The clients receiving trade confirmations and account statements had no way of knowing by reviewing these documents that I had never engaged in transactions represented on the statements and confirmations. I knew those false statements and account statements would be and were sent to clients through the U.S. Mails from my office here in Manhattan.

Another way that I concealed my fraud was through the filing of false and misleading certified annual reports and financial statements -- excuse me. Another way that I

concealed my fraud was through the filing of false and misleading certified audit reports and financial statements with the SEC. I knew that these audit reports and financial statements were false and that they would also be sent to clients. These reports, which were prepared here in the Southern District of New York, among other things, falsely reflected my firm's liabilities as a result of my intentional failure to purchase securities on behalf of my advisory clients.

Similarly, when I recently caused my firm in 2006 to register as an investment adviser with the SEC, I subsequently filed with the SEC a document called the form ADV uniform application for investment adviser registration. On this form I intentionally and falsely certified under penalty of perjury that Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities had custody of my advisory clients' securities. That was not true, and I knew it when I completed and filed the form with the SEC, which I did from my office on the 17th floor of 885 Third Avenue, here in Manhattan.

In more recent years, I used yet another method to conceal my fraud. I wired money between the United States and the United Kingdom to make it appear as though there were actual securities transactions executed on behalf of my investment advisory clients. Specifically, I had money transferred from the U.S. bank account of my investment

advisory business to the London bank account of Madoff
Securities International Limited, a United Kingdom corporation
that was an affiliate of my business in New York. Madoff
Securities International Limited was principally engaged in
proprietary trading and was a legitimate, honestly run and
operated business. Nevertheless, to support my false statement
that I purchased and sold securities for my investment advisory
clients in European markets, I caused money from the bank
account of my fraudulent advisory business, located here in
Manhattan, to be wire transferred to the London bank account of
Madoff Securities International Limited.

There were also times in recent years when I had money, which had originated in the New York Chase Manhattan bank account of my investment advisory business, transferred from the London bank account of Madoff Securities International Limited to the Bank of New York operating bank account of my firm's legitimate proprietary and market making business. That Bank of New York account was located in New York. I did this as a way of ensuring that the expenses associated with the operation of the fraudulent investment advisory business would not be paid from the operations of the legitimate proprietary trading and market making businesses.

In connection with the purported trades, I caused the fraudulent investment advisory side of my business to charge the investment advisory clients four cents per share as a

commission. At times in the last few years, these commissions were transferred from Chase Manhattan bank account of the fraudulent investment advisory side of my firm to the account at Bank of New York, which was the operating account for the legitimate side of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, the proprietary trading and market making side of my firm. I did this to ensure that the expenses associated with the operation of my fraudulent investment advisory business would not be paid from the operations of the legitimate proprietary trading and market making business. It is my belief that the salaries and bonuses of the personnel involved in the operation of the legitimate side of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities were funded by the operations of the firm's successful proprietary trading and market making businesses.

Your Honor, I hope I have conveyed with some particularity in my own words the crimes I committed and the means by which I committed them. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Madoff.

Mr. Sorkin, I don't think there was mention of an employee benefit plan.

MR. SORKIN: The pension fund was mentioned, your Honor.

THE COURT: What page that?

MR. SORKIN: I think it's page 2. If you look at the top, the victim -- I'm quoting -- the victims of my scheme

included individuals, charitable organizations, trusts, pension funds, and hedge funds.

THE COURT: I see.

And those pension funds include employee welfare benefit plans?

MR. SORKIN: Yes, your Honor.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, you can be seated for a moment.

Does the government believe that Mr. Madoff's admissions cover the elements of the crimes of each count?

MR. LITT: Yes, your Honor. The government does not entirely agree with all of the defendant's description of his conduct. However, the government does believe that his allocution does cover each of the elements of the charged offenses.

THE COURT: Would you summarize what the government's evidence would be if the defendant were to go to trial?

MR. LITT: Yes.

Had this case proceeded to trial, the government would have proven through testimony and evidence beyond a reasonable doubt all of the facts set forth in the criminal information.

In summary, the government would have proven the following: The defendant operated a massive Ponzi scheme

through his company, Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, beginning at least as early as the 1980s. Over the decades working from his New York City office and elsewhere, Madoff solicited and caused others to solicit prospective clients to open accounts with his company. His clients included individuals, charitable organizations, trusts, pension funds, and hedge funds, among others, and those clients were also his victims.

Madoff told those clients that he would invest their funds in publicly-traded securities, options, and treasury bills. In fact, over the life of his scheme Madoff did not buy stocks or options as he had promised. Instead, Madoff used client funds to pay other clients who sought to redeem their investments, and used so-called commission revenue generated by charging clients four cents per share for shares that he never, in fact, purchased to generate revenue for his firm. At times, his firm would have been unable to operate but for the cash generated from this Ponzi scheme. Madoff repeatedly lied to clients in person, on telephone calls, and through mailings, including account statements and confirmations of purchases and sales of securities that he mailed through the U.S. Postal Service.

Some investors sent checks to Madoff through the mails, others wired money to Madoff, and many of those wires came from outside New York State into the Southern District of

New York. Madoff also caused hundreds of millions of dollars of client funds to be wired overseas to accounts in London. Some of that money was sent back to his firm and used to pay its expenses. Other money was sent back and forth between New York and London to give the false impression that he was actually buying and selling securities in European markets when, in fact, he was not.

Madoff also used some of the money funneled through
London to support his lavish lifestyle. Madoff also used other
means of deception to hide his scheme. He lied when he told
clients that he was purchasing securities on their behalf.

He also lied to regulators, including the SEC. He filed false and fraudulent certified financial statements with the SEC that failed to disclose his fraud scheme, failed to disclose his liabilities to the victims of his Ponzi scheme, and contained false certifications that the audited statements had been prepared in accordance with generally-accepted auditing standards and principles.

Mr. Madoff lied in a form that he was required to file with the SEC as an investment adviser, claiming that his company had custody of client securities when, in fact, he had not purchased any securities for those clients.

He also lied at least seven separate times in an SEC deposition in 2006.

At the end, Madoff told his clients that he was

93CMMADP1 holding nearly \$65 billion in securities on behalf of those clients. In fact, he had only a small fraction of that amount. (Continued on next page)

93CGMADP2

1	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Madoff, please stand.
2	When you did the things you told me you did in your
3	statement, did you know that what you were doing was wrong and
4	illegal?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count One of the
7	information, guilty or not guilty?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
9	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Two of the
10	information, guilty or not guilty?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
12	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Three,
13	guilty or not guilty?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
15	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Four, guilty
16	or not guilty?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
18	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Five, guilty
19	or not guilty?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
21	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Six, guilty
22	or not guilty?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
24	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Seven,
25	guilty or not guilty?

	93CGMADP2
1	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
2	THE COURT: How do you plead to Count Eight, guilty or
3	not guilty?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
5	THE COURT: How do you plead to Count Nine, guilty or
6	not guilty?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
8	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Ten, guilty
9	or not guilty?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
11	THE COURT: And finally, how do you now plead to Count
12	Eleven, guilty or not guilty?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Did you do the things that you are charged
15	with doing in all 11 counts of the information?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: And are you pleading guilty because you
18	are guilty?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.
20	THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of
21	your own free will?
22	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.
23	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Madoff, you may be seated.
24	Based on what I have heard, I am inclined to accept
25	Mr. Madoff's guilty plea.

As I stated the other day, the government received a number of e-mails from victims objecting to any plea bargain or any plea deal. As it is clear that there is no plea bargain or plea deal, there is no basis for these objections. At this time, nonetheless, if there is any victim who signed our sign-in sheet who wishes to be heard on the question of whether I should accept Mr. Madoff's guilty plea, you can have a chance to speak now. We have a list.

Mr. Nierenberg, do you want to speak?

MR. NIERENBERG: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Come to the microphone.

And remember that today is not the sentencing. Victims will have a chance to speak at sentencing. Go ahead.

MR. NIERENBERG: I am one of the many victims of Madoff's egregious crimes. I don't know whether you had a chance to turn around and look at the victims --

THE COURT: Mr. Nierenberg, Mr. Nierenberg --

MR. NIERENBERG: I just wanted to --

THE COURT: Remain at the podium, please.

MR. NIERENBERG: All right. I know that the operation -- Madoff's operation was massive, that he didn't commit these crimes alone, and I don't understand why conspiracy is not a part of one of his pleas. Just to produce the reams of documents that were received and the elaborate data that went into them must have required an army of people

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to produce. And we all know that Madoff wasn't around a lot at his operation. There were other people that were there who handled it when he was gone. I --

THE COURT: I gather your point is that I should reject the plea because the government has not charged conspiracy?

The question is -- I'm not MR. NIERENBERG: No. suggesting that you reject the plea. What I'm suggesting is that there's an additional crime that was committed that wasn't included in the plea that needs to be considered.

THE COURT: All right. What I want to hear from now are victims who object to my accepting the plea.

> MR. NIERENBERG: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you object to my accepting the plea? MR. NIERENBERG: No, I don't.

THE COURT: Well, thank you, then. You can have your

MR. NIERENBERG: Okay.

THE COURT: Mark Labianca? No.

Brian Felsen? Mr. Felsen, do you want to be heard? MR. FELSEN: I would like to be heard, but I do not object to the plea.

THE COURT: All right. If you want to be heard with respect to sentencing, we will make sure we have procedures to give victims an opportunity to be heard at sentencing.

24 25

seat.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. FELSEN: Okay. 2 THE COURT: All right.

Bennett Goldwait? I can't quite read the handwriting.

Thank you.

MR. GOLDWORTH: Goldworth. No thank you.

THE COURT: Ronnie Sue and Dominic Ambrosino, do you wish to be heard?

MS. AMBROSINO: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right. Come forward, please. And say your name again when you get to the microphone.

MS. AMBROSINO: My name is Ronnie Sue Ambrosino, and I would object to the plea -- I just need to find a spot. I have taken a lot of notes. Judge, I believe that you have the opportunity today to find out information as to where the money is and to find out who else may be involved in this crime. And if that plea is accepted without those two pieces of information, then I do object. If you can ascertain that you can get those two pieces of information, I would love to see this man, who admits that he lied under oath in May of 2006 and sat here and took an oath today -- I would like to see him guilty.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. AMBROSINO: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Maureen Aebel? Go ahead.

MS. AEBEL: Judge Chin, I would like to present you with a different scenario that our country could witness if you

reject Mr. Madoff's plea. If we go to trial, we will show our people in this struggling country and the world, who looks to us as the global moral leader, that we hold all people accountable. If we go to trial, we can show all our world that all crimes, all crimes, including crimes of greed, can be dissected, ruled upon, and punished. And we can demonstrate that we are a country that can learn from our mistakes, and we will be then able to reexamine and improve the mechanisms that exist for our protection that have failed so completely. If we go to trial, we have more of a chance to comprehend the global scope of this horrendous crime. At trial we can hear and bear witness to the pain that Mr. Madoff has inflicted on the young, the old, and the infirmed. No man, no matter who he knows or who he is able to influence, is above the law. Thank you, Judge Chin.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. That is it with respect to the victims who signed up on the acceptance of the plea. Does the government or the defense want to respond to anything? Does the government want to respond to anything?

MR. LITT: May I just have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LITT: I think the only thing the government would say is that the government's investigation continues. It is continuing. A lot of resources and effort are being expended, both to find assets and to find anyone else who may be

responsible for this fraud.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Sorkin?

MR. SORKIN: Nothing at this time, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: First of all, I appreciate the comments from the victims. With respect to Ms. Ambrosino's comments about where the money is, as the government has just said, it is continuing its investigation, and this guilty plea certainly does not preclude the government from proceeding.

With respect to Ms. Aebel's comment about how a trial would show the world that we hold all people accountable, I believe that these proceedings will do the same thing.

Mr. Madoff, please stand. I am accepting the plea.

Mr. Madoff, because you acknowledge that you are guilty as charged in Counts One through Eleven of the information, because you know your rights and are waiving them, because your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact for each of the elements of the 11 offenses, I accept your guilty plea and adjudge you guilty on Counts One through Eleven of the information. You can be seated.

Mr. Madoff, the probation department will prepare a presentence report to assist me in sentencing you. You will be interviewed by the probation department, and it is important that you give the probation officer truthful and accurate

information, for the report is important in my decision as to what your sentence will be. You and your attorney have a right and will have an opportunity to review the report, to challenge or comment upon it and to speak on your behalf before sentencing.

Sentencing is set for June 16th at 1:30 p.m.

Turning to bail, is the government requesting that I remand Mr. Madoff pending sentencing?

MR. LITT: Yes. The government moves for remand at this time pursuant to 18 USC 3143, which puts the burden on the defendant to show by clear and convincing evidence that he can be trusted to appear for future court appearances.

The defendant has now pled guilty and been found guilty of 11 -- or does the Court wish to hear argument now or --

THE COURT: Well, let me ask Mr. Sorkin whether he opposes remand.

MR. SORKIN: We do, your Honor, and I'd like to be heard on that point.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Sorkin.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you, your Honor. May I go to the podium, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, wherever you would like.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you. Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, let me take just a little bit of while, because I want

to review the history of the bail as it related to this case.

THE COURT: Yes. The government provided me with the transcripts and the letter briefs, and I've reviewed them too.

MR. SORKIN: I'm not going to go through every one of them, but I think it's important that I list the chronology and how we got to this point today.

THE COURT: That's fine. That's fine.

MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, this case started when Mr. Madoff on December 10th confessed his wrongdoing to his two sons, knowing full well that his two sons were going to turn him in. He didn't run. He didn't attempt to flee at that time. When he was arrested by the FBI the next morning, he confessed to the FBI.

He appeared on December 11th before Magistrate Judge Eaton, and a personal recognizance bond of ten million dollars was signed by Mr. Madoff and his wife. There were three additional cosigners that were required, and it was secured by Mr. Madoff's residence in Manhattan. Surrender of Mr. Madoff's travel documents took place, and his travel was restricted to the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the District of Connecticut.

The Pretrial Services at the time, your Honor, did not recommend in its initial recommendation that Mr. Madoff be remanded, and I add additionally that the government had no difference and no objection with any of the conditions that

were imposed on December 11th. That was before Magistrate Judge Eaton.

On December 17th, your Honor, before another magistrate judge, Magistrate Judge Gorenstein, Mr. Madoff -- and it was ratcheted up -- was placed on home detention in his apartment with electronic ankle bracelet monitoring. He was permitted to travel only to his attorney's offices and to the court. A curfew of 7:00 p.m. through 9:00 a.m. was imposed, and this was done in addition to the entry of confession of judgments with respect to his wife's properties on Montauk, New York, and Palm Beach, Florida, a surrender of Mrs. Madoff's passport and a reduction of the number of cosigners on the bond from four to two. This, too, your Honor, was consented to by the government. Indeed, I believe it was done by stipulation without argument before Magistrate Judge Gorenstein.

On December 19th, again, on consent of the government, a ten million dollar personal recognizance bond was signed by Mr. Madoff, his wife, and his brother, secured by confessions of judgment on his wife's properties in Montauk, in New York, and Palm Beach. The passports of both Mrs. Madoff had already been surrendered, and other than scheduled court appearances, Mr. Madoff was confined to his home 24 hours a day. He was no longer permitted to visit his counsel. And they had, in addition to the 24-hour-a-day confinement, an electronic monitoring device, which is still attached to his ankle.

At his wife's own expense --

THE COURT: Would the audience please remain quiet. Go ahead.

MR. SORKIN: Because Mr. Madoff's assets were all frozen, but his wife's were not, although she later voluntarily committed to a freeze of her assets under certain restrictions. So with the government's consent, Mrs. Madoff's own assets, which were not frozen by Judge Stanton or any judge in this court -- she agreed to pay a security firm acceptable to the government to provide the following services to prevent harm or flight.

And with these unfrozen assets, not objected to by the government, Mr. Madoff has round-the-clock monitoring at his building 24 hours a day, including video monitoring of all of his apartment, doors, communications devices, and services permitting security to send a direct signal from an observation post to the FBI in the event of even the suspicion of harm or flight. This is known as a panic button. There are additional guards available on request, if necessary, to prevent flight or harm, both inflicted by Mr. Madoff -- I'm dealing with the danger to the community issue -- and also harm to Mr. Madoff.

On January 12th, your Honor -- and again, this was by consent of the government. On January 12th, Magistrate Judge Ronald Ellis imposed additional restrictions. This was briefed, as your Honor well knows. It was argued by Magistrate

Judge Ellis. And on that date, Magistrate Judge Ellis incorporated the restrictions set forth in the order of Judge Stanton, who has jurisdiction over the SEC matter, including restrictions on the transfer of all property whatsoever wherever located in the possession or under the control of Mr. Madoff. And that was part of the SEC consent under the TRO and also the consent under the preliminary injunction, which Mr. Madoff consented to. Magistrate Judge Ellis incorporated these restrictions to a voluntary restraint agreement, which the government agreed to, involving Mrs. Madoff's assets and restricted the transfer of all assets owned by her voluntarily, your Honor.

Additionally, Magistrate Judge Ellis directed the compilation of an inventory of all valuable portable items in the Manhattan home, which is to be checked once every two weeks by government-approved security, who are also required to inspect all outgoing mail.

The government appealed Magistrate Judge Ellis' ruling, and before District Judge Lawrence McKenna on January 16th, 2009, argument was held. The matter was briefed, and Judge McKenna added additional conditions: One, a compilation of any inventory of all valuable portable items in the homes in Montauk, Palm Beach, as well as any property owned by Mrs. Madoff in a small residence in France.

I quote, which your Honor, I'm sure, has read, from

Judge McKenna's statement in court after hearing argument and seeing papers, that, quote -- and this is from Judge McKenna -- I think the chances of Mr. Madoff fleeing at this point are as close to nil as you can get in any bail package, period, unquote.

Now, nothing has changed, your Honor, and I agree it has changed substantially in terms of the plea. And I agree with Mr. Litt that the burden is upon us to show by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Madoff is neither a flight risk nor a risk to the community.

As far as we are aware, your Honor, Pretrial Services has not found that Mr. Madoff has been negligent or careless in complying with all of the bail conditions. There has been no incident at all, as far as we are aware, that has been conveyed to us by Pretrial or the government that Mr. Madoff has attempted at any time to flee or certainly, which the government conceded before Magistrate Judge Ellis and Judge McKenna, posed any risk of harm. The argument before Judge Ellis and Judge McKenna was the risk of harm was in the financial world, that he would dissipate assets. That was taken care of, your Honor, respectfully, by Magistrate Judge Ellis and by Judge McKenna. All mail going out, all packages going out are inspected by the security firm approved by the government.

I respectfully submit, your Honor, that the change has

been the media attention and the increased and, in many cases, justifiable anger by people who claim they lost money, but the Bail Reform Act doesn't deal with those two issues. I do not believe, your Honor, that the precedent set in this court where such individuals as Rigas in the Adelphia case, Ebbers in the WorldCom case, Messrs. Skilling and Lay -- Mr. Lay passed away before sentencing -- all of whom were facing substantial years in prison, Rigas and Ebbers in this court, Mr. Skilling in Texas. All were released on bail pending sentence. All went to trial but did not plead guilty, and all, your Honor, as far as I am aware, never once confessed at the get-go to the wrongdoing that you heard Mr. Madoff confess to today.

So I would respectfully submit, your Honor, that there is no chance that Mr. Madoff will certainly be a risk to the community, a danger to the community. And his risk of flight -- and I agree with Judge McKenna -- is virtually nil with all of the restrictions that have been imposed on him. So I respectfully request that his bail be continued.

I would also add, your Honor -- again, I refer to the Bail Reform Act as not being relevant on those two other issues. What is also relevant, your Honor, is that Mr. Madoff is going to have the opportunity, I am sure, if the government and the defense can come to some agreement, to review literally thousands of thousands of documents which the trustee and the government have been reviewing to discover where this

forfeiture number comes from. And we've been able to communicate with him in his apartment, and I think that is a factor that your Honor should consider, even though that is not my argument with respect to the Bail Reform Act. I think we have met all the conditions under the act.

So by clear and convincing evidence, I don't think he is a risk of either danger to the community, flight, and I would respectfully request that his bail be continued. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't need to hear from the government. It is my intention to remand Mr. Madoff.

Please, ladies and gentlemen, please.

Now, I have a number of people who signed in who wanted to be heard on the issue of bail, and I think you should only be heard if you object to remand.

Adriane Biondo? Mr. Ross? Helen Chaitman?

MS. CHAITMAN: No objection.

THE COURT: Donald Schupak?

MR. SCHUPAK: I do not object.

THE COURT: Mark Labianca?

MR. LABIANCA: I do not object.

THE COURT: Sharon Lissauer?

As Mr. Madoff has pled guilty, he is no longer entitled to the presumption of innocence. The exposure is great, 150 years in prison. In light of Mr. Madoff's age, he

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

has an incentive to flee, he has the means to flee, and thus, he presents a risk of flight. Bail is revoked, and the defendant is remanded.

MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, would your Honor consider, respectfully, a stay so that we might appeal your Honor's bail decision? We intend to do it expeditiously.

THE COURT: The request for a stay is denied.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Sentencing, as I said, is set for June 16th, 1:30 p.m. Some of the victims may wonder why do we need so much time. Well, the probation department has to prepare a presentence report. By law, the defendant is entitled to 35 days to review the presentence report before sentencing. We also have to give the parties an opportunity to submit written materials.

Mr. Madoff, I will see you at sentencing. We are adjourned.

2.2